

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: John M. Hall

Serial No.: 09/810,281

Filed: March 15, 2001

Docket No.: 10004375-1

Title: NETWORK SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING USER-RELATIVE ADDRESSING

---

**REMARKS**

The following remarks are made in response to the Non-Final Office Action mailed January 10, 2005. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Weik, U.S. Patent No. 6,587,549 ("Weik"). Claims 1-6, 14, 15, 18, 19, and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by Agraharam et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,987,508 ("Agraharam") in view of Weik. Claims 7-10, 16, 17, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Agraharam in view of Weik, and further in view of Takahashi, U.S. Patent No. 6,442,589 ("Takahashi"). Claims 19 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weik in view of Agraharam. Claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weik in view of Takahashi. Claims 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by Weik in view of McDowell et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,438,583 ("McDowell").

With this Response, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 14, 15, and 17 have been amended. Claims 1-21 remain pending in the application and are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

**35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections**

The Examiner rejected claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Weik, U.S. Patent No. 6,587,549 ("Weik"). The Examiner stated that Weik discloses:

determining whether the destination information specifies a sender-relative destination (Weik: col. 2, lines 44 – col. 3, line 3; destination information is sender-specific information whether it be on the black or white list, these are relative to the sender information. If there not a match with the black list, the email is processed. If there is a positive match with the white list, the email may be forwarded to a special address). (Office Action at page 3).

The limitation addressed by the Examiner above is directed to determining what the "destination information" specifies, and more particularly to determining whether the destination information specifies a sender-relative destination. There is no teaching or suggestion in Weik regarding specifying a sender-relative destination in a communication, or looking at destination information in a communication and determining the type of destination information specified (e.g., sender-relative or absolute). Weik's disclosure that an

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: John M. Hall

Serial No.: 09/810,281

Filed: March 15, 2001

Docket No.: 10004375-1

Title: NETWORK SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING USER-RELATIVE ADDRESSING

---

email could be erased if the sender appears on a black list, or a copy of the email could be forwarded to another email address to have a backup copy if the sender appears on a white list, is a simple comparison of the sender's email address to a list of email addresses, and says nothing about destination information specified in the email, making a determination as to what is specified in the destination information, or determining whether destination information in the email "specifies" a sender-relative destination. The fact that an email in Weik may be forwarded to a destination that is different than the destination specified in the original email, apparently without even the knowledge of the sender, does not mean that destination information in the original email "specifies" a user-relative destination, or that a determination is made whether the destination information in the original email specifies a user-relative destination.

The Examiner stated that Weik discloses:

- providing action information identifying a plurality of actions associated with a plurality of sender-relative destinations (Weik: col. 2, line 44 – col. 3, line 3; black list = forwarded to address for scrap functions; white list forwarded for further processing);

- identifying a first action in the action information based on the received destination information (Weik: col. 2, line 44 – col. 3, line 3; black list = forwarded to address for scrap functions; white list forwarded for further processing based on sender-specific data), the first action associated with the first sender-relative destination (Weik: col. 2, lines 44-47; forward to);

- identifying a first attribute in the sender record based on the first action and the received destination information (Weik: col. 2, lines 44-64; attribute is the match); (Office Action at page 3).

The Examiner appears to indicate above that the black list and white list disclosed in Weik are sender-relative destinations and that the actions are to forward an email. First, the black list and white list are simply lists of email addresses, and there is no teaching or suggestion in Weik that these lists include any sender-relative destinations. Second, there is no teaching or suggestion in Weik that an action is identified "based on the received **destination information**". Weik discloses that the name or email address of the **sender** is compared to the white list and black list. (Weik at col. 2, lines 36-61). Thus, the decision of whether to forward the email to an address for scrap functions, or forward the email for further processing is based on the **sender** specified in the email, and not based on **destination information** specified in the email. Third, the Examiner appeared to indicate above that the

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: John M. Hall

Serial No.: 09/810,281

Filed: March 15, 2001

Docket No.: 10004375-1

Title: NETWORK SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING USER-RELATIVE ADDRESSING

---

identified attribute is a matching entry in the black list or white list. However, an entry in the black list or white list is not identified “based on the first action and the received destination information”. The Examiner indicated above that the “actions” were to forward the email to an address for scrap functions, or forward the email for further processing. An entry in the black list or white list is not identified based on these forwarding actions. Likewise, an entry in the black list or white list is not identified based on destination information specified in the email. Rather, Weik discloses that the **sender** specified in the email is compared to the black list or white list.

In view of the above, Weik does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claim 18. The Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), and requests allowance of this claim.

**35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections**

The Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 14, 15, 18, 19, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by Agraharam et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,987,508 (“Agraharam”) in view of Weik. Actually, the inclusion of claims 18, 19, and 21 in the rejection appears to be a typographical error, since the Examiner never addressed these claims in the rejection. Thus, Applicant’s remarks with respect to this rejection are directed to claims 1-6, 14, and 15.

To clarify the invention recited in independent claims 1 and 14, Applicant has amended these claims herein to replace the word “user” with “sender”. Independent claims 1 and 14, as amended herein, include the limitations “associating a plurality of sender-relative destinations with a corresponding plurality of actions”, “identifying a first action in the plurality of actions associated with the first sender-relative destination”, and “determining a first absolute destination for the communication based on the first action and the sender identification information.”

The Examiner has acknowledged that “[t]he Agraharam reference does not explicitly state identifying the sender.” (Office Action at page 4). Agraharam does not teach or suggest any of the above-quoted limitations. Agraharam discloses the use of an alias email address that consists of a recipient’s telephone number. (See, e.g., Agraharam at col. 1, lines 44-46). A message addressed to that alias email address is translated by a translation server to the actual email address for the recipient. (See, e.g., Agraharam at col. 1, lines 52-55).

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: John M. Hall

Serial No.: 09/810,281

Filed: March 15, 2001

Docket No.: 10004375-1

Title: NETWORK SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING USER-RELATIVE ADDRESSING

---

Agraharam determines the actual email address based on the received alias email address. (Agraharam at col. 1, lines 59-63). Both the actual email address and the alias email address relate to the **recipient**. (Agraharam at col. 1, lines 59-63). There is no teaching or suggestion in Agraharam that the actual email address is determined based on a **sender** of the email. Agraharam does not teach or suggest “associating a plurality of sender-relative destinations with a corresponding plurality of actions”, “identifying a first action in the plurality of actions associated with the first sender-relative destination”, or “determining a first absolute destination for the communication based on the first action and the sender identification information”, as recited in independent claims 1 and 14.

Weik also does not teach or suggest the above-quoted limitations of claims 1 and 14. With respect to the rejection of claim 18, the Examiner stated that Weik discloses:

providing action information identifying a plurality of actions associated with a plurality of sender-relative destinations (Weik: col. 2, line 44 – col. 3, line 3; black list = forwarded to address for scrap functions; white list forwarded for further processing);

identifying a first action in the action information based on the received destination information (Weik: col. 2, line 44 – col. 3, line 3; black list = forwarded to address for scrap functions; white list forwarded for further processing based on sender-specific data), the first action associated with the first sender-relative destination (Weik: col. 2, lines 44-47; forward to). (Office Action at page 3).

The Examiner appears to indicate above that the black list and white list disclosed in Weik are sender-relative destinations and that the actions are to forward an email. As described above with respect to claim 18, the black list and white list are simply lists of email addresses, and there is no teaching or suggestion in Weik that these lists include any sender-relative destinations. Thus, Weik does not teach or suggest “associating a plurality of sender-relative destinations with a corresponding plurality of actions” as recited in independent claims 1 and 14.

There is no teaching or suggestion in Weik that the identified action is “associated with the first sender-relative **destination**”. Weik discloses that the name or email address of the **sender** is compared to the white list and black list. (Weik at col. 2, lines 36-61). Thus, the decision of whether to forward the email to an address for scrap functions, or forward the email for further processing is based on the **sender** specified in the email, and it is not

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: John M. Hall

Serial No.: 09/810,281

Filed: March 15, 2001

Docket No.: 10004375-1

Title: NETWORK SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING USER-RELATIVE ADDRESSING

---

associated with a **destination** specified in the email. Thus, Weik does not teach or suggest “identifying a first action in the plurality of actions associated with the first sender-relative destination” as recited in independent claims 1 and 14.

There is also no teaching or suggestion in Weik that an absolute destination is determined based on the first action. The Examiner indicated above that the “action” disclosed in Weik is to forward the email. There is no teaching or suggestion in Weik to determine an absolute destination for a communication based on such an action. Thus, Weik does not teach or suggest “determining a first absolute destination for the communication based on the first action and the sender identification information” as recited in independent claims 1 and 14.

In view of the above, Agraharam and Weik, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claim 1 or independent claim 14. The Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claims 1 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and requests allowance of these claims. Since dependent claims 2-6 and 15 further limit patentably distinct claim 1 or claim 14, claims 2-6 and 15 are believed to be allowable over the cited references, and allowance of claims 2-6 and 15 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 7-10, 16, 17, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Agraharam in view of Weik, and further in view of Takahashi, U.S. Patent No. 6,442,589 (“Takahashi”). Actually, the inclusion of claim 20 in the rejection appears to be a typographical error, since the Examiner never addressed this claim in the rejection. Thus, Applicant’s remarks with respect to this rejection are directed to claims 7-10, 16, and 17.

Claims 7-10 are dependent on independent claim 1. Claims 16 and 17 are dependent on independent claim 14. As described above with respect to claims 1 and 14, Agraharam and Weik do not teach or suggest the above-quoted limitations of claims 1 and 14. Takahashi also does not teach or suggest the limitations of claims 1 and 14 addressed above.

In view of the above, Agraharam, Weik, and Takashi, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of dependent claims 7-10, 16, and 17. Since dependent claims 7-10, 16, and 17 further limit patentably distinct claim 1 or 14, claims

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: John M. Hall

Serial No.: 09/810,281

Filed: March 15, 2001

Docket No.: 10004375-1

Title: NETWORK SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING USER-RELATIVE ADDRESSING

---

7-10, 16, and 17 are believed to be allowable over the cited references, and allowance of claims 7-10, 16, and 17 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weik in view of Agraharam. Claims 19 and 21 are dependent on independent claim 18. As described above with respect to claim 18, Weik does not teach or suggest the above-quoted limitations of claim 18. Agraharam also does not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 18 addressed above.

In view of the above, Weik and Agraharam, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of dependent claims 19 and 21. Since dependent claims 19 and 21 further limit patentably distinct claim 18, claims 19 and 21 are believed to be allowable over the cited references, and allowance of claims 19 and 21 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Weik in view of Takahashi. Claim 20 is dependent on independent claim 18. As described above with respect to claim 18, Weik does not teach or suggest the above-quoted limitations of claim 18. Takahashi also does not teach or suggest the limitations of claim 18 addressed above.

In view of the above, Weik and Takahashi, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of dependent claim 20. Since dependent claim 20 further limits patentably distinct claim 18, claim 20 is believed to be allowable over the cited references, and allowance of claim 20 is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by Weik in view of McDowell et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,438,583 ("McDowell"). Independent claim 11 includes the limitations "a controller coupled to the receiver and the memory, the controller configured to: identify whether the destination information specifies a sender-relative destination; perform at least one search of the directory server based on the stored search information and the sender identification information if the destination information specifies a sender-relative destination; and identify at least one absolute destination based on the search."

The Examiner indicated that Weik discloses at column 2, lines 37-44, a controller configured to identify whether destination information in a received communication specifies

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: John M. Hall

Serial No.: 09/810,281

Filed: March 15, 2001

Docket No.: 10004375-1

Title: NETWORK SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING USER-RELATIVE ADDRESSING

---

a sender-relative destination. (Office Action at page 10). Weik, at column 2, lines 37-44, discloses that sender-specific data of an incoming email can be used in pre-sorting the email. The limitation addressed by the Examiner above is directed to identifying what the “destination information” specifies, and more particularly to identifying whether the destination information specifies a sender-relative destination. There is no teaching or suggestion in Weik regarding specifying a sender-relative destination in a communication, or looking at destination information in a communication and identifying the type of destination information specified (e.g., sender-relative or absolute).

Weik’s disclosure that an email could be erased if the sender appears on a black list, or a copy of the email could be forwarded to another email address to have a backup copy if the sender appears on a white list, is a simple comparison of the sender’s email address to a list of email addresses, and says nothing about destination information specified in the email, making a determination as to what is specified in the destination information, or identifying whether destination information in the email “specifies” a sender-relative destination. The fact that an email in Weik may be forwarded to a destination that is different than the destination specified in the original email, apparently without even the knowledge of the sender, does not mean that destination information in the original email “specifies” a user-relative destination, or that a determination is made whether the destination information in the original email specifies a user-relative destination. McDowell also does not teach or suggest a controller configured to identify whether destination information in a received communication specifies a sender-relative destination.

The Examiner indicated that Weik discloses at column 2, lines 44-61, a controller configured to perform at least one search of a directory server based on the stored search information and the sender identification information if the destination information specifies a sender-relative destination. (Office Action at page 10). The Examiner acknowledged, however, that “[t]he Weik reference does not explicitly state a directory server.” (Office Action at page 10). Weik, at column 2, lines 44-61, discloses that sender specific data are compared with either a black list or a white list. There is no teaching or suggestion in Weik regarding searching a directory server, let alone searching a directory server based on stored search information [that identifies searches associated with sender-relative destinations] and sender identification information, as recited in claim 11. The Examiner stated that “[t]he

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: John M. Hall

Serial No.: 09/810,281

Filed: March 15, 2001

Docket No.: 10004375-1

Title: NETWORK SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING USER-RELATIVE ADDRESSING

---

McDowell references teaches LDAP with a directory server (McDowell: col. 6, lines 12-18; Figure 12)". (Office Action at page 8). However, there is no teaching or suggestion in McDowell that the directory server is searched based on stored search information [that identifies searches associated with sender-relative destinations] and sender identification information, as recited in claim 11.

The Examiner indicated that Weik discloses at column 2, lines 62-66, a controller configured to identify at least one absolute destination based on the search. As described above, there is no teaching or suggestion in Weik regarding searching a directory server. If no such search is taught or suggested, it logically follows that Weik also does not teach or suggest identifying at least one absolute destination based on such a search. Weik, at column 2, lines 62-66, discloses that if the result of the comparison with the white list is positive, a backup copy of the email is stored. This cited portion of Weik does not teach or suggest identifying at least one absolute destination based on a search of a directory server. As described above, there is also no teaching or suggestion in McDowell that a directory server is searched based on stored search information [that identifies searches associated with sender-relative destinations] and sender identification information. If no such search is taught or suggested, it logically follows that McDowell also does not teach or suggest identifying at least one absolute destination based on such a search.

In view of the above, Weik and McDowell, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claim 11. The Applicant respectfully requests removal of the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and requests allowance of this claim. Since dependent claims 12 and 13 further limit patentably distinct claim 11, claims 12 and 13 are believed to be allowable over the cited references, and allowance of claims 12 and 13 is respectfully requested.

**Examiner's Response to Applicant's Remarks**

With respect to claims 1-6, 14, 15, 18-19, and 21, the Examiner indicated that the rejection of these claims has been amended to address Applicant's arguments. (Office Action at page 12). Applicant has addressed the Examiner's rejection of these claims above, and respectfully submits that the cited prior art does not teach or suggest these claims.



**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: John M. Hall

Serial No.: 09/810,281

Filed: March 15, 2001

Docket No.: 10004375-1

Title: NETWORK SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING USER-RELATIVE ADDRESSING

---

In response to Applicant's previously submitted remarks regarding claims 11-13, the Examiner stated that:

With regards to claims 11-13, applicant argues the Weik reference does not teach or suggest identifying whether this sender-specific data specifies a sender-relative destination and searching a directory sever.

**In response**, the examiner respectfully submits:

The Weik reference does not teach identifying sender-relative destination. Weik, col. 2, lines 31-43 teaches email is processed and designated or assigned. The assignment criteria relates to sender-specific data of the incoming email, particularly "name or email address of the sender." Weik, col. 2, line 44 – col. 3, line 3, teach and illustrate the processing of the email if the sender-specific data comparison with black and white lists are positive. If the black list comparison produces a positive match, an action is taken whether it be erased, stored, or **forwarded, to a special address**. (Emphasis Added). Similarly if a positive match is generated from the white list comparison, the email is passed on for further processing to be stored under, or **forwarded to, a special address** in parallel to the further processing of the email. (Emphasis Added).

Weik teaches the breadth and details of the claim with the comparison of sender-specific data to determine an address in which the email is addressed and forwarded to.

With regards to the Weik reference no teaching searching a directory server, the examiner has amended the 103 to better illustrate the combination. Although Weik does not teach the directory server, Weik does teach the control as admitted by Applicant, and does teach the search by way of the comparison with the respective black and white lists. (Office Action at pages 12-13).

With respect to the Examiner's statement above that "[t]he Weik reference does teach identifying sender-relative destination", Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 11 does not recite "identifying sender-relative destination". Claim 11 recites a receiver for receiving a communication that includes destination information, and a controller configured to "identify **whether the destination information specifies** a sender-relative destination". The Examiner's paragraph that was quoted above, which discusses black and white lists, does not even mention the destination specified in the email. Weik's disclosure that an email could be erased if the sender appears on a black list, or a copy of the email could be forwarded to another email address to have a backup copy if the sender appears on a white list, is a simple comparison of the sender's email address to a list of email addresses, and says nothing about destination information specified in the email, making a

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: John M. Hall

Serial No.: 09/810,281

Filed: March 15, 2001

Docket No.: 10004375-1

Title: NETWORK SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING USER-RELATIVE ADDRESSING

---

determination as to what is specified in the destination information, or identifying whether destination information in the email “specifies” a sender-relative destination.

With respect to the Examiner’s statement that “[w]ith regards to the Weik reference no teaching searching a directory server, the examiner has amended the 103 to better illustrate the combination”, Applicant does not understand this comment. The language and citations used by the Examiner in the current rejection of claim 11 appear to be identical to the language and citations used by the Examiner in the previous rejection. It is not clear to Applicant what has been amended by the Examiner. It is also not clear to Applicant what the Examiner is referring to in stating that Applicant has admitted that “Weik does teach the control.” Applicant is not aware of any such admission, and respectfully requests that the Examiner identify the basis for this statement.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims 1-21 are in form for allowance and are not taught or suggested by the cited references. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of claims 1-21 is respectfully requested.

No fees are required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16(b)(c). However, if such fees are required, the Patent Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant’s representative at the below-listed telephone numbers to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to either Jeff D. Limon at Telephone No. (541) 715-5979, Facsimile No. (541) 715-8581 or Jeff A. Holmen at Telephone No. (612) 573-0178, Facsimile No. (612) 573-2005. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

**Amendment and Response**

Applicant: John M. Hall

Serial No.: 09/810,281

Filed: March 15, 2001

Docket No.: 10004375-1

Title: NETWORK SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR PROVIDING USER-RELATIVE ADDRESSING

---

**Hewlett-Packard Company**

Intellectual Property Administration

P.O. Box 272400

Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

John M. Hall,

By his attorneys,

DICKE, BILLIG & CZAJA, PLLC

Fifth Street Towers, Suite 2250

100 South Fifth Street

Minneapolis, MN 55402

Telephone: (612) 573-0178

Facsimile: (612) 573-2005

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

JAH:jmc

3/28/05



Jeff A. Holmen

Reg. No. 38,492

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8:

The undersigned hereby certifies that this paper or papers, as described herein, are being deposited in the United States Postal Service, as first class mail, in an envelope address to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 28<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2005.

By \_\_\_\_\_

Name: Jeff A. Holmen

